

REMARKS

Reconsideration of this application and entry of the foregoing amendments are respectfully requested.

The claims have been revised to define the invention with additional clarity. The claims as presented are fully supported by an enabling disclosure, including the claims as originally filed. That the claims have been amended should not be construed as an indication that Applicant agrees with any position taken by the Examiner. Rather, the revisions are made merely to advance prosecution and Applicant reserves the right to pursue any deleted subject matter in a continuation application.

The Examiner's objection to claim 1 is moot in view of the above-noted claim revisions.

Claims 1, 2, 5 and 7 stand rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite. Withdrawal of the rejection is believed to be in order in view of the above-noted claim revisions and for the reasons that follow.

The Examiner objects to the phrase "minimal effect". That phrase does not appear in the claims as now presented.

The Examiner also indicates that the nature of the "effects" on sex organs is unclear. It is respectfully submitted that one skilled in the art would fully

appreciate the nature of such effects. In this regard, attention is directed to the attached portions of the Physician's Desk Reference (PDR) (1999) relating to medroxyprogesterone acetate (MPA) from two sources (new claim 8 indicates that the effects of the agent administered on sex organs is less than that of MPA). The PDR portions make clear the effects of MPA on sex organs both from the standpoint of clinical pharmacology and adverse reactions. Since many of the effects noted by the PDR relate to female sex organs, Applicant further submits herewith a number of technical articles that describe the effects of MPA on the sex organs of various species of males (including primates). Given the extensive literature available at the time relevant date relating to the effects of MPA on sex organs, it will be clear that no indefiniteness results from the present claim language.

As regards the recitation of SCH-23390, attention is directed to the fact that the present claims do not include that designation (but rather the corresponding formula).

Reconsideration is requested.

Claims 1, 2 and 5 stand rejected under 35 USC 103 as allegedly being obvious over Aristoff et al. Withdrawal of the rejection is submitted to be in order in view of the above-noted claim revisions and comments that follow.

The claims as now presented relate to a method of reducing atherosclerotic plaque load in the vessels of a patient.

As the Examiner appreciates, the citation relates to a method of treating angiogenesis. The method comprises administering a combination of a suramin-type compound and an angiostatic compound, 17 α -hydroxy progesterone being an example of an angiostatic compound. The article says nothing of reducing plaque load but rather refers to the treatment of diseases of neovascularization using the suramin/angiostic compound combination. Accordingly, nothing in the citation would have suggested the use of the present progestational agents in the claimed method.

Reconsideration is requested.

Claims 1, 3, 4, 6 and 7 stand rejected under 35 USC 103 as allegedly being obvious over Cincotta. Withdrawal of the rejection is submitted to be in order in view of the above-noted revisions and further in view of the comments that follow.

Cincotta relates to a method of reducing restenosis in a mammal undergoing a non-bypass invasive procedure. As indicated in the paragraph bridging columns 1 and 2 of the citation, restenosis results from a complex series of events. The method of inhibiting restenosis comprises

administering a dopamine-potentiating/prolactin-reducing compound (halperidol being an example of a prolactin enhancer) to reduce blood prolactin levels during at least a portion of the daylight hours and continuing that administration during the healing period of the injury.

Nothing in Cincotta teaches or would have suggested the use of haloperidol to reduce atherosclerotic plaque load. Indeed, the Examiner has not provided any basis for concluding otherwise.

Reconsideration is requested.

This application is submitted to be in condition for allowance and a Notice to that effect is requested.

Respectfully submitted,

NIXON & VANDERHYE, P.C.

By Mary J. Wilson
Mary J. Wilson
Reg. No. 32,955

MJW:tat

1100 North Glebe Road
8th Floor
Arlington, Virginia 22201-4714
Telephone: (703) 816-4000
Facsimile: (703) 816-4100